MYSORE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

FIFTIETH DAY.

Thursday, 1st May 1958.

The House met in the Assembly Hall, Vidhana Soudha, Bangalore, at One of the Clock.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER (SRI L. H. THIMMA BOVI, B.A.) in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

Major Irrigation Schemes in Belgaum District.

Q.—1644. Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum I).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) the number of Major Irrigation Schemes that have been started, during the last three years in Belgaum District;

(*b*) the total expenditure on each scheme since their inception together with their names and locations;

(*c*) the total number of acreage brought under direct irrigation, indirect irrigation and seasonal irrigation in each of such schemes;

(*d*) which of those schemes yield more than 4 per cent interest on the capital invested or spent by Government; and which of them yield less than that with the reasons for lower yield?

A.—Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Minister for Public Works).—

(*a*) One.

(*b*) Rs. 39.96 lakhs, up to December 1957. Ghataprabha Project Stage II (*i*) Extension of Ghataprabha Left Bank Canal from 45 to 73 miles.

(*c*) No area has been brought under irrigation.

(*d*) It is a scarcity area scheme and does not yield 4 per cent interest on the capital invested by Government.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—May I know, Sir, whether this is a major irrigation scheme or whether it is a scheme under scarcity conditions?

*Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—Ghataprabha Second Stage is a major irrigation scheme. It is not a work under scarcity conditions.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—My question is: with reference to (*d*), I want to know the distinction between scarcity scheme and major irrigation scheme.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—Scarcity area schemes include such cases where a definite return is not insisted upon. Generally major irrigation schemes, are expected to give a certain percentage of return on the capital invested. When major irrigation schemes are taken up in scarcity areas that percentage of return is not insisted upon.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—May I know why, when 28 miles of canal has been prepared at a cost of nearly 40 lakhs of rupees, no area has been brought under irrigation. Does it mean that no water has been supplied to the lands?

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—Please repeat the question.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—You say in answer (*b*) that the canal from 45 to 73 miles has been prepared and the cost is given as 40,000. I want to know why water was not given even when the canal was ready at a cost of Rs. 40 lakhs.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—Canal work from 45 to 73 miles is under progress.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—So, water is not supplied to these 28 miles of canal?

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—So far as I am aware, it is not supplied.

* Asterisk indicates that the remarks or speeches have not been revised by the member concerned.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Was it taken up for providing work in scarcity areas or as a major irrigation work, Sir?

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—Both the objects are fulfilled. It is a scarcity area and it is also a major irrigation scheme. Work will be provided for people and water will be provided for lands in those areas and scarcity will be minimised.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—May I know whether for this scheme which comes under scarcity works, the Government intends to fix up water rate for the water that is supplied to people?

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—Yes.

Sri A. R. PANCHAGAVI.—Does the Government hope to finish the work during the Second Five-Year Plan and the digging of the left bank canal?

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—Yes. The work is progressing according to schedule. There is no delay. It is hoped to complete it within the Second Five-Year Plan period.

Sri A. R. PANCHAGAVI.—The amount required for the left bank channel is four crores and the amount provided in the Budgets is very meagre. Does the Government hope to complete the work?

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—Some amount is provided according to estimates prepared and the quantity of work that may be carried out during this year. If more work can be done and if more money is required, Government will certainly provide the necessary funds.

Sri P. G. SIDHANTI.—Will there be a storage dam?

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—That is another question. That question is still to be decided.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Is that question of storage dam a disputed point between the Bombay State and Mysore State?

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—I would like to explain the position, so that there may not be any doubt in the minds of Hon'ble Members. Two storage dams were proposed, one at Hadalga and another at some place higher up. Both these places are in the Bombay area and we therefore approached the Bombay Government for permission to allow our engineers to inspect the area and carry out a survey and start the preliminary work of road making and things like that, and they said that they would consider sympathetically. After some time, on account of political developments, as many Hon'ble Members are perhaps aware, on account of the border dispute now people seem to be against the Government of India giving us permission. Especially, some *SAMITHI*—I do not know which *samithi*—seems to have passed a resolution insisting upon the Bombay Government not to allow the Mysore Government to take up the work in that area until and unless this border dispute is settled. It is only hearsay. But whatever it is, I am placing it before the House without any reservation.

The second point is, Sir, it is very unfortunate that this question of development of the area should have been linked with border dispute. Now the Mysore Government have suggested to our engineers to find out the possibility of alternate site for the purpose of putting the dam. Preliminary surveys have been conducted and a site has been found and so far as things stand at present, it is found quite suitable. Instead of two dams as proposed in the Bombay area, only one dam within the Mysore State area will serve the purpose, and both storage area and the dam will lie within the Mysore State limits. Therefore, there will be no trouble. Still, detailed investigation has to be carried out and finalised. The standing technical committee of expert engineers is visiting the said site that is now proposed and after their inspection and report, perhaps we have got to write to the Government of India and they will send their own team of experts and have this question examined and the matter will be decided. If in the meanwhile, the Bombay Government permits—we are still asking them for permission—both the alternatives will be before the Government, that is, the advice of the technical committee and the sites as already proposed. As to which of the sites will have to be decided upon is a matter that will have to be considered.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Is the Government aware that the stand taken by the Bombay Government is to solve this problem on some principle and that they are ready to hand over these sites to this Government ? Are the Government aware of this ?

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—I will not enter into any discussion. Whatever may be the reason, this has after all nothing to do with our disputes. We will have many more disputes between State and State. I am not able to understand why those disputes should be linked up with development work. I do not know the attitude taken by the Bombay Government. They have not yet decided. It is the *Samithi* that seems to have passed a resolution. Perhaps the Bombay Government are seized of this resolution. I cannot answer for the Bombay Government as to what they aim to do.

Sanction for the construction of Tank near Karlagatta in Shikaripur Taluk.

Q.—2320. Sri A. S. DUDHYA NAIK (Honnali).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) when sanction was accorded for the work relating to the tank on the outskirts of Karlagatta in Shikaripur taluk ;

(*b*) the reasons for not completing the same so far ?

A.—Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Minister for Public Works).—

(*a*) An estimate for improvements to the tank called Karlagatta Doddakere was sanctioned in October 1949.

(*b*) The contractor to whom the work was entrusted stopped the work during 1950, after doing a part of the work. The work was entrusted to another contractor, who did not even attempt to execute the work. The contract was cancelled and the work was entrusted to a third contracter who is now doing the work.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎಸ್. ದೂಧ್ಯನಾಯಕ್.—ಈ ಕೆರೆ ಕೆಲಸದ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಅಂದಾಜು ಆದ ಮೊಬಲಗೆಷ್ಟು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಕರೆಘಟ್ಟ ಊರಿನ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಗೌರಿಕೆರೆ, ಹೊಸಕೆರೆ ಮತ್ತು ದೊಡ್ಡಕೆರೆ ಎಂದು ಮೂರು ಕೆರೆಗಳಿವೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಎರಡು ಕೆರೆಗಳಿಗೆ ರೀಪೇರಿ ಅಗತ್ಯ ವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮೂರನೆ ಕೆರೆಗೆ ಎಂದರೆ ದೊಡ್ಡಕೆರೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟದ್ದಿರ ಬಹುದು ಎನ್ನುವ ಲೆಕ್ಕದ ಮೇಲೆ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆ ಕೆರೆ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ 2,250 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಅಂದಾಜು ಆಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎಸ್. ದೂಧ್ಯನಾಯಕ್.—ಇಷ್ಟು ಸಣ್ಣ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಕಂಟ್ರಾಕ್ಟುದಾರರು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅಲ್ಲವೆ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಬ್ಬರಂತೂ ಅರ್ಧಂಬರ್ಧ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಿ ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟರು. ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರು ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಕೈ ಹಾಕಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಮೂರನೆಯವರು ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಇದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಆರ್. ಪರಮೇಶ್ವರಯ್ಯ.—ಈ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾಡದೆ ಮಧ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟುಹೋದವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಏನು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಅದು ಬಹಳ ಹಳೆಯ ಕಥೆ. ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ತರಿಸಿದೆ. ಈ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಪೀಸ್‌ವರ್ಕ್ ಸಿಸ್ಟಂ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿತ್ತು. ಕಂಟ್ರಾಕ್ಟುದಾರನಿಂದ ಡಿಪಾಸಿಟ್ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಇದ್ದಷ್ಟಕ್ಕಿದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡದೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹೋದರು. ಅವರು ಎಲ್ಲಿರುವರೆಂಬುದು ತಿಳಿಯದೆ ಏನೂ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಇದೆ. ಇದು 1949ನೆ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂದರೆ 8–9 ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಹಿಂದೆ ನಡೆದ ವಿಚಾರ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಆರ್. ಪರಮೇಶ್ವರಯ್ಯ.—ಹಿಂದೆ ಆದಂತೆ ಆಗದೆ ಇರಲು ಮೂರನೆಯವರು ಓಡಿಹೋಗದೆ ಇರುವಂತೆ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಾ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎಸ್. ದೂಧ್ಯನಾಯಕ್.—ಒಂಬತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಕೆರೆ ರೀಪೇರಿ ಆಗದೆ ಆ ಕೆರೆಕೆಳಗೆ ಇರುವ ಅಚ್ಚುಕಟ್ಟುದಾರರಿಗೆ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲ ಮತ್ತು ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಕೆರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೀರು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ನಿಲ್ಲಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದ್ದರಿಂದ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಿರಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎಸ್. ದೂಧ್ಯನಾಯಕ್.—ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಕಂದಾಯವನ್ನು ಅಚ್ಚುಕಟ್ಟುದಾರರಿಗೆ ವಾಪಸು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕ್ರಮತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ?